



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,074	06/24/2003	Tetsuo Takeshima	36856.1090	1234

7590 03/17/2004

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
Suite 312
10400 Eaton Place
Fairfax, VA 22030

EXAMINER

BUDD, MARK OSBORNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/602,074

Applicant(s)

TAKESHIMA, TETSUO

Examiner

Mark Budd

Art Unit

2834

AW

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/834,679.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angona in view of Sakamoto or Hayashi.

Angona teaches a piezoelectric multi layer laminated bender producing acoustic waves. The laminated body is encapsulated in a potting compound (resin). Angona does not explicitly teach the poling-directions for the piezo elements or a specific Youngs Modulus for the resin. However, each of Hayashi (figs 3 and 6) and Sakamoto (figs. 3 and 6) and Sakamoto (figs. 1, 2 and 4) teach piezoelectric bimorph benders can be poled in the same direction to produce the desired bending. It has long been held that optimization of a known device (e.g. thru routine experimentation) for a specific application is within the skill expected of the routineer. Thus to select same direction poling and a specific Yangs modulus for the coating would have been within the skill expected of the routineer. The specific electrode lead architecture of claims 6-8 would occur to the skilled artisan as both convenient and necessary depending on where the electrical connections and working surfaces.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angona in view of Sakamoto or Hayashi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Huguenin or Furbacher.

Art Unit: 2834

This claim adds that notches are provided in the protection layer to expose the connection terminals. Each of Furbacher (fig. 3) and Huguenin (figs. 1-6 and 11) explicitly teach such an accommodation to allow external connections to be made to the transducer. Thus for at least this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide terminal cut outs in Angona.

Claim 3 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Budd/ds

03/03/04

MAKH D. BUDD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2834